



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,650	01/05/2001	Brett B. Stewart	5285-00106	7041

7590 05/13/2003

Jeffrey C. Hood
Conley, Rose, & Tayon, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MYHRE, JAMES W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3622	

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/755,650	Applicant(s) Stewart
	Examiner James W. Myhre	Art Unit 3622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W. Myhre

(3) _____

(2) Jeff Hood

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 9, 2003

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Lawlor et al (6,202,054), Rudow et al (6,236,360), and Farmakis et al (5,714,948)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Applicant Representative discussed how the invention differed from Lawlor's system in which the user connects the portable device to a telephone line, stressing that the invention uses wireless technology and that there were a plurality of wireless access points within a given location, such as an airport terminal. The Examiner noted that this still seemed to read on cellular telephone systems and, although not referred to in the final rejection, the older car phone systems of the 1980's. After much discussion on ways in which the claims could be amended to overcome the rejection, no agreement was reached. The Applicant will attempt to amend the claims to better clarify the key features that the wireless access points are not cellular telephone antenna and, depending on what is disclosed in the specification, that the wireless access points "ping" the remote devices to identify them instead of the identification process being initiated by the remote device.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

JAMES W. MYHRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3622

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required